

Integrated Access Council
June 21, 2004
1:00-2:00pm
SML Room 409

Present: Dale Askey, Katie Bauer, Matthew Beacom, Meg Bellinger, Dan Chudnov, Ann Green, Katherine Haskins, Julie Linden, Kenny Marone, Fred Martz, Jack Meyers, Kim Parker, Bobbie Pilette, Tom Saul, Kalee Sprague, David Stern, Rich Szary

Absent: Joan Swanekamp, Frank Turner

Meg opened the meeting by asking if there were any comments about the minutes from the last meeting. She also stated that she had received a few questions from members regarding Roy's presentation on the Rescue Repository and asked if there were any other comments. After hearing no more comments Kim said, "silence is trust". Meg announced that there will be no meeting in July, but asked that members send her a list of their top 5 integrated access issues or concerns that need to be addressed in the IAC.

1. Rescue Repository Update – Fred Martz

Fred said that the outcome of the Rescue Repository Task Force was that the Implementation Group should now go forward with their work. Audrey, David Gewirtz, Roy Lechich, and Gail Barnett have met and have already begun their work with a tight timetable with hopes of having the first ingestion by the end of summer. Research was already done for the hardware and software and some work was done on the ingest process. They still need to look at how to handle the ingest of the large quantity in backlog and the ongoing process. This core group will consult with others such as Brian Kupiec in Beinecke and Karen Reardon who is working with the Digital Resources Collection.

Meg commented that this is a slightly different way of implementation than we are used to and asked if everyone was comfortable with this. She said that she will visit members of LMC to discuss their collections and how to handle them.

Kim asked if there would be some communication process from the Core group to the stakeholders as to where the process is. Meg replied that there will be a project plan on the website.

Kalee asked if the project manager was one of the four core people. Fred said no, we are not forming a committee in the usual manner with a chair or project manager. In this scenario we have the implementation group. The manager of that group is the project manager. They are not named as such by LMC or Meg or the University Librarian.

2. Restructuring of the Library Systems Office – Fred Martz

Meg said that the idea of restructuring the Systems Office came from the fact that there are a lot of projects going on involving research and planning, but that this research is not

necessarily linked to the Systems Office. There needs to be someone who is accountable. She is trying to give emphasis and balance to the activities that are currently going on.

This restructuring grew out of the Strategic planning efforts, and is a federated approach to an integrated library. Many of the restructuring characteristics are from the strategic planning. We are trying to coordinate the efforts in research.

Fred handed out a diagram of the new Integrated Library Technology Services (formerly LSO) consisting of the Library Technology Research and Planning Team and the Library Technology Implementation & Operations Team. He pointed out that a key element of the diagram is that the two boxes do overlap and intersect. IAC is on the right hand side and will have several smaller groups under it. Fred said that the Research and Planning Group is meeting for the first time this week and has members from both teams. Fred said this new structure has two key groups from the Systems Office under Karen and Audrey and a third from ITS under Gail Barnett.

Fred said that projects could wait until all research and planning is done and then be turned over to the Implementation system, but then they would know nothing about the specs. Instead the specs will be gotten and then turned over to the Implementation Team (as was done with the Rescue Repository).

The Systems retreat brought up the question of how to balance between daily spectrum and new initiatives. Fred pointed out that the objective here is balance. He has combined Audrey's team and the programming team into a new group. Scheduling will be moved down from Fred to Audrey. Negotiations will take place with various units such as Cataloging or Acquisitions and then Audrey will put out a 4-month schedule. If priorities change the time frame can also change. The objective is to streamline the infrastructure work.

Meg commented that she was surprised to see how the LSO was organized before she got here.

Karen's group started as workstation support and then changed to web technologies (as the web came into being). The group also works with faculty when they want to use web technology in their teaching. This group will have the expanded responsibility of training and helping faculty using images (visual resources needs). There is going to be an added position in this group to make it responsible for training, documentation, consulting, and scanning.

Meg said that she is part of a group (which also includes Chuck Powell and Jill Carlton) looking at the University Portal. There are plans to refresh the student portal and perhaps the faculty portal. This new position will be at the center of the design, look and feel. There needs to be an allocation of resources and time.

Fred pointed out another characteristic of the diagram – the horizontal line. A recent example of this is the collaboration across the University.

Julie asked if Karen's group would work in the same way with 4-month blocks. Fred said perhaps not. In respect to needing certain projects done, both groups will operate the same in

prioritizing. There will be a published schedule. IAC is where there are different portals to get project needs into the right areas. If there are new needs these should come to the IAC.

Kim said that there is one line between the two teams. If we are to keep going with existing projects and yet take on new ones, how can this be accomplished without new members? Fred said there are two key factors to database loads. If they are more than monthly they become ongoing. Currently at ITS there are over 40 servers. We either need to add new resources or streamline the process so they don't take as long. We need to keep on the lookout for enhancements to cut down on time. We are looking at getting the servers across the board in sync so as not to have to treat each separately.

Meg said as technology becomes part of everyone's job, how do we address this question. Kenny said that turnover also factors into this. Meg is committee to a federated management style. She said an example would be that Cindy is currently doing an internship in the Systems Office and that hopefully she will take skills that she learns back to Access Services.

Another point talked about in LSO is the culture of perfection in the library system. Every detail such as those in Voyager must be perfect. There are many areas that want their own special reports. Fred said we are looking at 80% of functionality in 20% of time. Around here it is tough. Every manager or librarian has his or her favorite cliental.

Kenny commented that something is better than nothing. She is not a perfectionist. If it makes the lives of the circulation staff easier then the system is good. Fred said we need to weigh the impact of the requests to see where we put our time and effort for the most people. David commented that the day-to-day status quo would be done by managers. If it is a new priority IAC will decide where to put it. Fred said that the managers would talk to each other and also bring issues to IAC, LMT, CDC, etc. David said that he hopes that a manager never gives up a priority. Kenny asked if this was a paradigm shift. She did say that she wanted to acknowledge Matthew and his group because her people are using the web more.

Dale said we are not buying fewer books and that Orbis should remain in the picture. Meg replied that the process of buying, cataloging, tracking, etc, would not change. Fred also replied that nothing he said was meant to imply that we would short change Orbis. 95% of the people use Orbis daily. We can't let that system slide, but we need to work on other items too. Kenny asked that with 10% turnover how do we deal with this. Matthew said we are trying to mainstream cataloging staff techniques. Orbis is one tool among many. It is easy to forget that and only think of Orbis.

Ann asked if the architecture group was a spin off of the IAC or within the Research and Planning Team. Fred said it is separate from IAC. The key element of the Research and Planning Team is to make a more effective integration of the system. Dan said he sees the same names and the same positions. Given the small turn around will there be a true change? Fred said we are calling this a restructuring not reorganization – a change of intent. He commented that the staff is eager to do this. The tough part is getting others to accept this change. Kenny said this is a good chance to ask questions of what we want.

3. Next Steps for Digital Preservation Planning – Meg Bellinger

Meg said the process of developing a task force has raised a lot of questions. Are there structures in place to address these? Kim said the CDC task force that is winding down made their final report and that CoDGeR deals with preservation. Meg said there needs to be a Digital Preservation Committee that reports to IAC. Bobbie said we need to define what we mean by digital preservation. Kenny said perhaps we could see what other research libraries are doing. Meg said we need to develop practices and cases. Most of the requests she gets are supporting faculty. We need to look at things such as cost, define the user base, etc.

Jack asked what is going on in the professional schools. Do the librarians associated with them know what is needed? Katherine said that Art is willing to work with the University and that Architecture is more on the ball. David said that Forestry and Environmental Studies at best is faking it, but that they do put out their own bulletin.

Meg asked how we get at the needs. Do we put out a survey? Jack said probably not. This group would be good instead. Meg said we do need to look at this. Katherine said there are educational proponents. Why do it? Why think about it at all? Meg suggested that we initiate the Digital Preservation Group and nominated Bobbie as Chair.